

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,950	11/27/2000	Richard E. Smalley	11321-P002D1	5035
47744 ROSS SPENCE	7590 03/19/200 ER GARSSON	EXAMINER		
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C. P. O. BOX 50784 DALLAS, TX 75201			COLE, ELIZABETH M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		•	1771	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MOI	NTHS	03/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/722,950	SMALLEY ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Elizabeth M. Cole	1771			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
		action is non-final.	<i>:</i>			
'	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>35-44,46,47,50 and 51</u> is/are pending	in the application.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>35-44, 46, 47, 50-51</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) 🔲 🤈	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment	Ne)					
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summan	y (PTO-413)			
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date			

Application/Control Number: 09/722,950

Art Unit: 1771

1. Claims 39 and 40 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claims 39 and 40, line 3, it appears that "?" should be "±". Appropriate correction is required.

Page 2

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 3. Claims 35-44, 46, 47, 50-51 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,969,504. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each discloses a material comprising a material comprising single wall carbon nanotubes wherein at least 10% are (10,10) carbon nanotubes.
- 4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/06 have been fully considered and are persuasive regarding the prior art rejection set forth in the previous office action. The

Art Unit: 1771

claims are allowable over the prior art as set forth in the previous rejection. The primary reason for the indication of allowability is that Applicant's argument regarding the lack of motivation to combine the teachings regarding laser vaporization as taught by Curl "Collapse and Growth" with the invention disclosed in "Growth Morphologies" is persuasive. Specifically, Curl, "Collapse and Growth", teaches that increased yields of Buckminster fullerenes are produced when laser vaporization is employed. However, "Collapse and Growth" does not provide a teaching or motivation that employing laser vaporization in the invention of "Growth Morphologies" would have formed a rope comprising single wall carbon nanotubes having 50-5000 single wall carbon nanotubes of which greater than 10% are (10,10) single-wall carbon nanotubes. Further, there would not have been a reasonable expectation of success that a rope comprising single wall carbon nanotubes having 50-5000 single wall carbon nanotubes of which greater than 10% are (10,10) single-wall carbon nanotubes would be formed by employing laser vaporization in the invention of "Growth Morphologies", since "Collapse and Growth" is drawn to increasing yields of Buckminster fullerenes which are structurally different than carbon nanotube ropes. Similarly, "Collapse and Growth" does not provide a teaching or motivation that employing laser vaporization in the invention of "Growth Morphologies" would have formed a felt comprising single wall carbon nanotubes wherein the single wall carbon nanotubes comprise ropes of single wall nanotubes. wherein greater than 10% of the single wall carbon nanotubes are (10,10) single-wall carbon nanotubes. Further, there would not have been a reasonable expectation of success that a felt comprising single wall carbon nanotubes wherein the single wall

Art Unit: 1771

carbon nanotubes comprise ropes of single wall nanotubes of which greater than 10% are (10,10) single-wall carbon nanotubes would be formed by employing laser vaporization in the invention of "Growth Morphologies", since "Collapse and Growth" is drawn to increasing yields of Buckminster fullerenes which are structurally different than carbon nanotube ropes and felts comprising such ropes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

Mr. Terrel Morris, the examiner's supervisor, may be reached at (571) 272-1478.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1771